

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 10-12, 14, 15, 17 and 19-24 remain pending in the present application. Claims 7-9, 13, 16 and 18 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4-6 and 10 have been amended. Claims 19-24 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the telephone discussion on June 19, 2006. In the discussion, Applicants described the amendments to the claims which attempt to define our system as a generally straight line, Kinmartin, et al. makes a 90° turn. The specific limitations discussed were the parallel wall portions located on opposite sides of a stepped portion. While no agreement was reached, an understanding of the direction that Applicants were trying to amend in was understood.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 / § 103

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Kinmartin, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,101,883). Claims 1 and 10 have been amended such that the partition board defines a first portion, a second portion and a stepped portion disposed between the first and second portions. The first portion is defined as being generally parallel to the second portion.

Kinmartin, et al. includes baffle 34 which the Examiner defines as the partition board with a stepped portion. The baffle 34 of Kinmartin, et al. defines a first portion, a second portion and a stepped portion between the first and second portion but the first and second portions of baffle are generally perpendicular and are not generally parallel as is defined by amended Claims 1 and 10. This is because baffle 34 turns the air flow 90° as shown in Figures 1 and 4.

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 1 and 10, as amended, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2 and 11, which ultimately depend from Claims 1 and 10, respectively, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Claims 7, 8, 11 and 13 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJOINDER

Applicants respectfully request the rejoinder of withdrawn Claims 3-6, 12, 14, 15 and 17.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 19-24 are dependent claims which Applicants believe properly further limit their respective base claim. Applicants believe Claims 19-22 read on the elected species. Applicants respectfully request the rejoinder of Claims 23 and 24.

PRIOR ART

Applicants believe that no reference relative to the pending claims is currently known.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 20, 2006

By: 
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg